

**LUMMI NATION  
WETLAND INVENTORY UPDATE  
YEAR 3 SYNTHESIS REPORT  
2007**



November 2007

**LUMMI NATION**

**WETLAND INVENTORY UPDATE**  
**YEAR 3 SYNTHESIS REPORT**  
**2007**

**Prepared for:**

**Lummi Indian Business Council  
(LIBC)**

**Funded by:**

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
(Grant No. BG-97042602-0)**

**Prepared by:**

**Water Resources Division  
Lummi Natural Resources Department**

**Primary Author:**

**Lee First, PWS, LIBC Water Resources Planner II**

**Primary Contributors:**

**Ann Stark, GISP, GIS Manager  
Jeremy Freimund, P.H., Water Resources Manager**

**November 2007**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. BACKGROUND/INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. METHODS FOR WETLAND INVENTORY UPDATE .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 METHOD FOR WETLAND MAPPING/BOUNDARY DETERMINATION .....	7
2.2 METHOD FOR WETLAND FUNCTION ASSESSMENT .....	9
2.3 METHOD FOR WETLAND RATING/CLASSIFICATION .....	11
2.4 METHOD FOR UPDATING THE LUMMI NATION GIS WETLAND INVENTORY/DATABASE .....	12
2.5 METHOD FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL .....	12
<b>3. WETLAND INVENTORY UPDATE RESULTS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1 RESULTS OF WETLAND MAPPING AND BOUNDARY DETERMINATION .....	12
3.2 RESULTS OF FUNCTION ASSESSMENT .....	17
3.3 RESULTS OF WETLAND CLASSIFICATION .....	20
<b>4. DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>5. REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>25</b>

Appendix A – Individual Wetland Maps

Appendix B – Sample of Field Notes and Function Assessment Worksheets


## 1. BACKGROUND/INTRODUCTION

The Lummi Indian Reservation (Reservation, see Figure 1) is located along the western boundary of Whatcom County, Washington and includes the mouth of the Nooksack and Lummi rivers. Both the Nooksack and Lummi river watersheds are under environmental pressures from rapid regional growth. The Lummi Nation has also entered a period of rapid economic development under self-governance. Growth on and near the Reservation requires that the Nation's core environmental program prioritize the development of a regulatory infrastructure that allows for responsible growth while protecting tribal resources and the Reservation environment. This regulatory infrastructure supports both the tribal goal and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) policy of tribal self-governance and recognition of sovereignty.

Previous EPA and other funding sources have supported the Lummi Nation's assessment of priority water resource needs and the identification of unmet needs. Environmental planning intended to protect the Nation's water resources has included development of a Storm Water Management Program (LWRD 1998), a Wellhead Protection Program (LWRD 1997, LWRD 1998), a Wetland Management Program (LWRD 2000), a Non-Point Source Management Program (LWRD 2001, LWRD 2002), and Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the Lummi Indian Reservation (LWRD 2007). These programs are components of a comprehensive water resources management program (CWRMP) being developed and implemented pursuant to Lummi Indian Business Council (LIBC) resolutions No. 90-88 and No. 92-43.

In January 2004, the Lummi Nation Water Resources Protection Code (Title 17 of the Lummi Code of Laws [LCL]) was adopted. Based on a Reservation-wide wetland inventory completed in 1999 (Harper 1999) and as described in Chapter 17.06 (Stream and Wetland Management) of the Code, different types of wetlands that vary in their quality and importance occur on the Reservation. In order to establish appropriate levels of protection, pursuant to LCL Chapter 17.06 the Reservation wetlands must be classified into one of four categories. Category 1 wetlands are considered Critical Value Wetlands that have a high and irreplaceable level of importance for fisheries, Lummi culture, and/or water quality on the Reservation. Category 4 wetlands have minimum habitat value and are suitable for restoration or enhancement efforts.

The purpose of the 1999 Reservation-wide wetland inventory was to identify wetland locations and to collect information on the characteristics and functions of the Reservation wetlands. The 1999 Reservation-wide wetland inventory (Harper 1999) relied largely on remotely sensed data (i.e., color and infra-red aerial photographs), generalized mapping (i.e., USDA soil survey), and limited field verification to identify wetland locations and sizes. In addition to identification and mapping, the 1999 inventory collected general wetland information including Cowardin classification (Cowardin et al. 1979),



This map and all other maps in this document are the property of the Lummi Nation. The Lummi Nation makes no claim as to the accuracy, completeness, or content of any data contained herein. Any user of this data assumes all responsibility for use thereof and further agrees to hold the Lummi Nation harmless from and against any damage, loss, or liability arising from any use of this data. This map is not intended to reflect the exterior or tidal boundaries of the Lummi Reservation. No part of this document may be reproduced without prior consent of the Lummi Nation.

Figure 1 - Regional Location of the Lummi Indian Reservation, Washington

water source, and soil type. The Washington State Function Assessment Method was applied to twelve (12) assessment units (AUs) in nine (9) selected wetlands on the Reservation. The 1999 inventory identified and mapped a total of 214 wetlands and wetland complexes on the Reservation (Figure 2). These wetland areas totaled 5,432 acres, or roughly 43 percent of the land area of the Reservation, excluding tidelands. Approximately 60 percent of these mapped wetland areas are located in the flood plains of the Lummi and Nooksack rivers.


Although the 1999 inventory represents an important planning tool and a significant improvement over the previously available information, which was largely from the National Wetlands Inventory (USFWS 1987), the 1999 inventory has proven to be too general for many planning efforts. The 1999 inventory either did not map some wetlands or generally shows larger wetland areas than are surveyed in the field or identified using Global Positioning System (GPS) technology. Refining the spatial resolution of the wetland mapping, performing function assessments, and classifying the wetlands into the regulatory categories identified in Title 17 is intended to support efforts to protect these wetland resources and the important ecological, hydrological, and water quality protection functions that they provide. Because of the large number of wetland areas on the Reservation, the effort to refine the spatial resolution of the wetland mapping, to perform function assessments, and to classify the Reservation wetlands is projected to require several years to complete. This report summarizes the results of the third year of this inventory update effort.

For the purposes of this inventory update, a wetland evaluation consists of conducting site visit(s), performing at least a reconnaissance level delineation, using the GPS to map the identified wetland boundaries, performing a function assessment largely using the Washington State Wetland Function Assessment Project (Hruby et al. 1999) methodology, and classifying the wetlands into one of four categories. Pursuant to Hruby (1999), only one function assessment was conducted if the wetland being categorized met the definition of a mosaic of wetlands or met other criteria of wetlands with several classes or subclasses.

This approach to identifying function assessment units resulted in the evaluation of twenty (20) wetlands during this third year of the inventory update (approximately 9 percent of the total number of wetlands identified during the 1999 inventory). When combined with the 36 wetlands identified during Year 1 and the 35 wetlands identified during Year 2, ninety-one (91) wetlands (approximately 42 percent) of the Reservation wetlands have been evaluated. Based on this experience and assuming the same evaluation methodology and rate, additional time will be required to complete an evaluation of all of the Reservation wetlands.



Figure 2 - 1999 Wetland Inventory Results



Estimated Wetlands - 1999

- Wetland
- Wetland Complex
- Parcels



This Year 3 wetland inventory update synthesis report is divided into the following sections:

- Section 1 is this background/introduction section.
- Section 2 describes the methods used to conduct the mapping, function assessments, and categorization of Reservation wetlands.
- Section 3 summarizes the results of Year 3 of the wetland inventory update.
- Section 4 provides a discussion of the third year results.
- Section 5 lists the references cited in the report.

Appendix A contains a map of each wetland mapped during the third year of the inventory update. The results from Year 1 and Year 2 are summarized in similar synthesis reports (LWRD 2005, LWRD 2006). The field notes and function assessment worksheets for each wetland are on file with the Lummi Water Resources Division. In Appendix B, an example of the field notes and function assessment worksheets completed for each wetland is provided.



## **2. METHODS FOR WETLAND INVENTORY UPDATE**

The methods used to update and refine the spatial resolution of the 1999 Inventory are described below. Ms. Lee First, a Water Resources Planner II in the Lummi Water Resources Division, applied the described methods. Ms. First is a Professional Wetland Scientist (PWS), has a Professional Certificate in Wetlands Science and Management (University of Washington 2001), and a Bachelors of Science in Environmental Studies (Western Washington University 1987). Ms. First also received additional training from the consulting firm Sheldon & Associates and from the Washington State Department of Ecology. Sheldon & Associates conducted a training session in the application of the Methods of Assessing Wetland Functions in July 2003 and Dr. Tom Hruby (Senior Ecologist, Washington State Department of Ecology) conducted two training sessions on the application of the *Revised Washington State Wetland Rating System in Western Washington* during May and August 2005. Field data were collected for the results summarized in this update from November 2006 through October 2007.

Five inter-related methods were used to update and refine the 1999 inventory. The different methods were used for wetland mapping/boundary determination, for wetland function assessment, for wetland rating/classification, for updating the Lummi Nation GIS wetland inventory/database, and for quality assurance/quality control.

### **2.1 Method for Wetland Mapping/Boundary Determination**

Because of property access issues, and the remoteness and size of some of the Reservation wetlands, it was not practical to undertake a geography-based approach (i.e., watershed by watershed) to selecting the wetlands evaluated during this study. Instead, the locations of the wetlands evaluated during this inventory update were based on areas where property was considered for purchase by the LIBC, development actions were contemplated, and/or on parcels for which Lummi Land Use Permit Applications were submitted to the Lummi Planning Department. In several areas, small and moderate sized wetland areas were discovered that had not been identified in the 1999 inventory.

During the planning stages for this update effort, it was estimated that approximately 70 wetlands could be evaluated during one year (approximately three days per wetland). This estimate proved to be overly optimistic due to a number of factors including property access issues and the remoteness and size of some of the wetlands. There were also seasonal considerations including long periods of flooding, frozen ground, and snow that limited and/or prevented wetland boundary determination during portions of the winter season. During the summer season, mapping forested wetland areas is problematic because GPS satellite signals were often difficult to obtain through the dense tree canopy. Of the 214 wetlands on the Reservation that were mapped during the 1999

inventory, twenty (20) wetland areas were field verified and mapped during this Year 3 effort. Function assessments were conducted and ratings/classifications were performed on each of the twenty (20) wetland areas during Year 3 of this inventory update effort (approximately 9 percent of the total number of inventoried wetlands). In several cases these function assessment units were a mosaic of wetlands that were in close proximity to each other. Although separate wetland boundaries exist within some of these wetland mosaics, they were considered as one assessment unit due to their similar characteristics and/or connectedness in the landscape. Only one function assessment was conducted if the wetland being categorized met the definition of a mosaic of wetlands or met other criteria of wetlands with several classes or subclasses (Hruby 1999).

In several cases, development actions were planned on a parcel of land where the 1999 inventory indicated that large wetlands or wetland complexes were located over contiguous parcels. Because acquiring landowner permission is time consuming – particularly for undivided parcels in trust status that may have in excess of 100 landowners, in many cases only a portion of the wetland boundary on the particular parcel where the development action was planned was mapped. As a result, there are several wetlands and numerous fragments of wetlands that have been mapped by Lummi Water Resources Division staff during the last several years. These areas are mapped or partially mapped and appear in Figure 3, Figure 4, and Appendix A. Work is in progress on these areas, and function assessments and classification/ratings have not yet been performed due to time constraints, adverse weather, and/or other reasons. These areas have been archived in GIS so that work can continue on these wetlands and mapping, function assessments, and categorization can be finalized in the future as this wetland inventory update is completed.

Once a wetland from the 1999 inventory or a land parcel was selected for evaluation, the methodology used to reliably identify and map the wetland boundaries was the following:

1. Prior to conducting a field visit, available remotely sensed data including high resolution aerial photography collected during 2004 (approximately 0.5 feet resolution) and high-resolution (approximately  $\pm 0.5$  feet accuracy) topographic information acquired in 2005 using Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) technology were reviewed. Maps developed as part of the USDA soil survey for the area (USDA 1992) were also reviewed.
2. Information developed during the 1999 wetland inventory, including watershed name and size, wetland size, Cowardin classes present, association with streams or other water resources, and USDA soil units in the vicinity was reviewed.
3. During the field visit(s), one of the following two methods for determining wetland boundaries were used:
  - If development activities were planned that would potentially impact wetlands, or a jurisdictional determination of the wetland boundary was required, the wetland boundary was determined in the field using the

criteria and methodology of the Wetland Delineation Manual (Manual) issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE 1987). This manual requires examination of three parameters: vegetation, soils, and hydrology. For an area to be classified as a wetland, hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology must be exhibited. The specified criteria are mandatory and must all be present, except under circumstances when a wetland is considered a disturbed area or a problem wetland. Once delineated, the wetland boundaries were recorded using a handheld Trimble GeoXT GPS unit, and downloaded into ArcMap9 GIS software. The horizontal accuracy of the Trimble GeoXT is  $\pm 2$  feet once the collected data are post-processed.

- If development activities were not planned, and or other conditions made locating the boundary difficult (i.e., lack of satellite configuration for the GPS unit, lack of permission to access property, or other reason), a "reconnaissance-level" boundary determination was made instead of a jurisdictional determination. Much more time would have been required if jurisdictional determinations were made on all the wetlands because wetland data plots along regularly spaced transects would have been required. For the reconnaissance-level of determination, the same criteria were applied, but in a less formal manner, or in some cases, only a portion of the wetland edge was recorded using a GPS unit, and the rest of the wetland boundary estimated using a combination of other methods (i.e., aerial photography and LIDAR). In some cases, portions of the wetland boundaries were recorded using a combination of an on-the-ground reconnaissance, GPS data, soil mapping, LIDAR data, and recent aerial photography.

## **2.2 Method for Wetland Function Assessment**

The *Methods for Assessing Wetland Functions, Volume 1* by the Washington State Wetland Function Assessment Project (Hruby et al. 1999) were used to assess functions of wetlands on the Lummi Reservation. The Washington State Method (commonly called WAFAM) is based on the nationally recognized Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) approach (Brinson 1993), which classifies wetlands based on landscape position and water regime, and provides guidance on arriving at technical assumptions on which assessments of performance of functions are based. The HGM method proposes the following classes of wetlands: Depressional, Fringe, Slope, Riverine, and Flats (Brinson 1993). The Washington State technical committee has thus far developed assessment methods only for depressional and riverine wetlands. Most of the wetlands on the Lummi Reservation fall into these two categories, although estuarine fringe and flats are also clearly present.

The Washington State approach (Hruby et al. 1999) relies on indicators of functions to assess potential performance, rather than direct measurements.

Indicators are usually physical characteristics of the wetland or its surrounding area that can be correlated to a specific function. For example, rather than trying to directly sample aquatic mammals, the presence of steep banks in the wetland can be used as an indicator of the suitability of the wetland habitat for aquatic mammals. After collecting detailed data on indicators, mechanistic models (mathematical equations) are applied to the data to arrive at a numeric indexed score. This step is based on the assumption that the relationship between indicators and the actual performance level for a function can be defined by a simple mathematical expression. Different models were developed for each subclass of wetland and for each function category (Hruby et al. 1999).

The first step in assessing wetland functions is to divide the wetland into an assessment unit (AU). Wetlands are divided into AUs based on differences in water regime. The AU boundary occurs where the volume, flow, or velocity of the water changes rapidly, whether created by natural or artificial features. An entire wetland may be uniform in its water regime and would therefore be comprised of a single AU.

As noted above, the WAFAM method relies on indicators of functions to assess potential performance rather than direct measurements. A total of fifteen (15) categories of functions are assessed for each wetland under the WAFAM method. The indices that result for each wetland function represent an assessment of performance relative to reference standard wetlands identified as having the highest level of performance within that wetland subclass.

The index of performance reflects the level of performance per unit area of the wetland being assessed. Another calculation must be made to factor in the size of the assessment unit to get a final performance index for that function of a particular assessment unit. The index denotes the assessed potential performance or habitat suitability based on the structural characteristic present in and around the assessment unit. The index does not denote the actual performance, as that would require detailed monitoring. It is assumed that the assessment unit will perform the function if the appropriate structural components are present and if the opportunity exists. A low index (i.e., 1,2,3) for a function does not necessarily mean the wetland is "unimportant." It may be the only wetland in the area providing certain functions.

## 2.3 Method for Wetland Rating/Classification

There is currently no tribal or federal rating system to categorize wetlands based on functions and values. As a result, the Washington State Department of Ecology's *Wetland Rating System for Western Washington – Revised* (Hruby 2004) was used to classify Reservation wetlands according to the Washington State Department of Ecology's Wetland Rating System. This document is a revision of the *Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington*, published by the Department of Ecology in 1991. For this Year 3 effort, the revised version was used for all wetlands inventoried.

The current version of the wetland classification system was designed to differentiate between wetlands based on their sensitivity to disturbance, their significance, their rarity, the ability to replace them, and the functions they provide. The classification system results in rating wetlands into one of the following four categories:

- Category 1 wetlands are those that represent a unique or rare wetland type, or are more sensitive to disturbance than most wetlands, or are relatively undisturbed and contain ecological attributes that are impossible to replace within a human lifetime, or provide a high level of functions (scores > 70 points).
- Category 2 wetlands are difficult, though not impossible to replace, and provide high levels of some functions (scores between 51 – 69 points). These wetlands occur more commonly than Category 1 wetlands, but still need a relatively high level of protection.
- Category 3 wetlands are wetlands with a moderate level of functions (scores between 30 – 50 points). They have been disturbed in some ways, and are often less diverse or more isolated from other natural resources in the landscape than Category 2 wetlands.
- Category 4 wetlands have the lowest levels of functions (scores less than 30 points) and are often heavily disturbed. These are wetlands that could be replaced, and in some cases, improved. These wetlands may provide some important ecological functions, and also need to be protected.

The rating categories are intended as the basis for developing standards for protecting and managing the wetlands to reduce further loss of their value as a resource. Some decisions that can be made based on the rating include the width of buffers needed to protect the wetland from adjacent development, the ratios needed to compensate for impacts to the wetland, and permitted uses in the wetland. The rating is the basis for determining the size of wetland buffers as mandated in Title 17 of the Lummi Code of Laws.

As a component of the rating process, a classification key was used to determine whether the wetland was riverine, depressional, slope, lake-fringe, tidal fringe or flats according to the HGM classification system.

## **2.4 Method for Updating the Lummi Nation GIS Wetland Inventory/Database**

As described in Section 2.1, the updated wetland boundaries were recorded using a mapping grade Trimble GeoXT GPS unit, and downloaded into ArcMap9 GIS software. Once entered into the GIS, any newly identified wetland areas were assigned an identification number based on the Public Land Survey System (i.e., Township, Range, Section) information. If a new wetland area essentially replaced an existing wetland, the original identification number was retained. If a wetland boundary was for a wetland that had not been previously identified, a new number based on the Public Land Survey System was assigned. Other data that were entered into the GIS database for new wetlands included wetland area in acres and hectares, comments about location or other unique features of the wetland, wetland rating/classification, hydrogeomorphic classification, Cowardin classification, the date the wetland was mapped, and watershed name. The Lummi Water Resources Division developed a new Access database during 2007 to better manage the collected information on the Reservation wetlands.

## **2.5 Method for Quality Assurance/Quality Control**

The Water Resources Planner II participated in two separate courses where her derived wetland ratings/classifications were compared with those of other specialists as a control on the quality of the wetland rating/classification process. In addition, once mapped in the GIS, the wetland boundaries identified with the GPS unit were compared with the 2004 high-resolution aerial photographs and the LIDAR data. In addition, a wetland consulting firm was selected through a competitive bid process and contracted to provide an independent peer review of the work performed by the Water Resources Planner II, to provide an overall assessment of the methodology used in the inventory update effort, and to provide recommendations for maintaining and/or improving the accuracy in the future. The results of their findings and recommendations for the overall program are to be summarized in a technical memorandum by December 31, 2007.

## **3. WETLAND INVENTORY UPDATE RESULTS**

The results from Year 3 of the wetland inventory update are summarized below. Detailed field forms for each wetland are maintained on file at the Lummi Water Resources Division office and an example of the documentation is included as Appendix B of this synthesis report.

### **3.1 Results of Wetland Mapping and Boundary Determination**

The twenty (20) wetland areas on the Lummi Reservation that were field verified and mapped during the third year of the wetland inventory update effort are shown in Figure 3. Detailed maps of each of these wetland areas are presented in Appendix A. Figure 3 and each of the detailed maps presented in Appendix A




show the wetland boundary identified as part of the third year of the inventory update in brown, the second year of the inventory update in blue, the first year of the inventory update in green, and the estimated wetland boundaries from the 1999 inventory in yellow. Where wetland areas are small and/or wetlands were close together, several wetlands are shown on the same map in Appendix A. As summarized in Table 1, a total of approximately 380 acres of wetlands were mapped during the third year of this effort. In comparison, during Year 1 a total of approximately 1,104 acres of wetlands were mapped and a total of approximately 579 acres of wetlands were mapped during Year 2.

The acreage of mapped wetlands has decreased in each annual report for the following reasons:

- The Year 1 Report summarized work that occurred over a period of almost three years and other staff assisted the Water Resources Planner II with the delineation of the Northern Lummi River Distributary Area and the Nooksack River Delta Area.
- The Year 2 Report summarized work that occurred over a one-year period.
- The Year 3 Report summarized work that occurred over a nine-month period with a reduced work week as the Water Resources Planner II worked only 32 hours a week starting in June 2006.

**Figure 3 - Updated Wetland Boundaries and Estimated Wetland Locations**



- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  Updated Wetland Boundary, 2005 |  Wetland Complex - Estimated 1999 |  Parcels |
|  Updated Wetland Boundary, 2006 |  Wetland - Estimated 1999         |  Roads   |
|  Updated Wetland Boundary, 2007 |  |   |

0 0.5 1 2 Miles



As evident in Figure 3 and the higher resolution mapping presented in Appendix A, the boundaries of all of the evaluated wetlands during Year 3 changed to some extent. Some of the wetlands were found to be smaller than mapped in the 1999 inventory, some were found to be larger than indicated in the 1999 inventory, some were found to be approximately the same size but in a slightly different location, one was a combination of previously identified wetlands, and four (4) were newly identified wetlands. For comparison purposes, all but one of the maps in Appendix A have the same map scale (1:5,000). One map has a smaller scale (1:7,000) so that the entire wetland area could be shown on one page. The wetland mapping and boundary determinations made during this Year 3 update effort and the associated wetland sizes are compared with the 1999 inventory results in Table 1.

As shown in Table 1, there were four wetland areas inventoried and mapped as part of this update that were not identified in the 1999 inventory. The area of these newly identified wetlands was approximately 8.92 acres. Including these four new wetland areas, a total of 8 wetland areas from the Year 3 effort have larger areas than identified during the 1999 inventory for a 76.15 acre total increase in wetland area when compared with the 1999 inventory. A total of 12 of the wetland areas inventoried and mapped as part of this Year 3 update were smaller than the areas mapped in the 1999 inventory for a 104.64 acre total decrease in wetland area when compared with the 1999 inventory. Overall, of the 20 wetland boundaries evaluated during Year 3, the total acreage of Reservation wetlands relative to the 1999 inventory decreased by 28.49 acres. When combined with the results from Year 1 and Year 2 (LWRD 2005, LWRD 2006), the net change in the total acreage of Reservation wetlands relative to the 1999 inventory has been a decrease of 244.78 acres.

**Table 1 – Wetland Size Comparison Results**

Wetland ID Number	Watershed Identification	1999 Inventory Wetland Size (Acres)	Inventory Update Wetland Size (Acres)	Difference in Wetland Size (Acres)
38N1E36-04	F	1.42	0.07	-1.35
38N1E25-03	F	26.41	19.28	-7.13
38N1E36-05	F	0.16	0.09	-0.07
38N1E36-02	F	11.09	4.17	-6.92
38N1E36-01	F	1.14	0.53	-0.61
38N1E23-08	G	0 <sup>1</sup>	0.61	+0.61
38N1E12-17	K	15.86	0.85	-15.01
38N1E12-18	K	97.88	124.61	+26.73
38N1E12-06	K	56.21	63.49	+7.28
38N1E11-04	K	18.46	4.34	-14.12
38N1E11-24	K	0 <sup>1</sup>	6.63	+6.63
38N1E11-23	K	0 <sup>1</sup>	1.36	+1.36
38N1E11-13	K	53.89	69.59	+15.7
38N1E11-01	K	14.34	13.17	-1.17
38N1E11-03	K	1.56	1.21	-0.35
38N1E11-02	K	51.55	20.87	-30.68
38N1E19-04	K	4.66	22.18	+17.52
38N1E04-09	R	26.75	12.75	-14.00
38N1E04-04	R	26.64	13.41	-13.23
38N1E04-10	R	0 <sup>1</sup>	0.32	+0.32
<b>Total</b>		408.02	379.53	-28.49

Notes:

<sup>1</sup>Wetland not identified in 1999 Inventory.

### 3.2 Results of Function Assessment

The Washington State Function Assessment Method (WAFAM) was applied to twenty (20) of the twenty (20) wetland Assessment Units (AUs). No tidal fringe wetlands were assessed during this time period.

Table 2 presents the indices for each AU for the functions that were assessed during Year 3 of the study. The general locations of the wetlands that were evaluated are shown in Figure 3, the specific locations are shown on individual maps in Appendix A, and a sample of field notes and function assessment worksheets are provided in Appendix B. As demonstrated by the results summarized in Table 2, a particular AU may vary significantly in its relative performance of one function to another. The WAFAM methodology was not designed to lump functions into group scores or to rank functions hierarchically by importance. Therefore, AUs are not compared using an overall index. Rather, the potential performance levels (the index) for each function are compared among the AUs of the same Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) category. Since different models were developed for each subclass, it is not meaningful to compare across categories. That is, riverine flow-through wetlands cannot be reasonably compared to depressional outflow wetlands. Each function index in the WAFAM is essentially a comparison of the assessed wetland to a large pool of reference wetlands.

The WAFAM methodology includes classification for riverine and depressional wetlands into subdivisions including Riverine Flow-through, Riverine Impounding, Depressional Outflow, and Depressional Closed. As summarized in Table 2, twelve (12) of the evaluated wetlands met the definition of depressional closed wetlands, eight (8) met the definition of depressional outflow wetlands.

**Table 2: Summary of Year 3 Function Assessments by Wetland ID number, Watershed, and HGM Subclass**

Wetland Name: Assessment Unit ID Number	38N1E36-04	38N1E25-03	38N1E36-05	38N1E36-02	38N1E36-01	38N1E23-08	38N1E12-17	38N1E12-18	38N1E12-06	38N1E11-04
Watershed ID	F	F	F	F	F	G	K	K	K	K
Hydrogeomorphic Subclass	DC	DO	DC	DC	DC	DC	DC	DO	DO	DC
Water Quality Functions										
Removing Sediment	10	7	10	10	10	10	10	6	8	10
Removing Nutrients	5	7	10	5	5	5	5	5	7	5
Removing Heavy Metals and Toxic Organics	6	4	7	2	4	5	4	5	6	5
Water Quantity Functions										
Reducing Peak Flows	10	7	10	10	10	10	10	6	8	10
Reducing Downstream Erosion	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	8	10
Recharging Ground Water	7	7	1	3	5	6	7	6	6	7
Habitat Suitability Functions										
General Habitat Suitability	1	6	3	5	4	3	5	7	8	3
Suitability for Invertebrates	1	4	3	5	3	2	4	6	9	2
Suitability for Amphibians	1	4	5	3	4	2	3	5	7	3
Suitability for Anadromous Fish	N/A	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	5	N/A
Suitability for Resident Fish	N/A	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	9	N/A
Suitability for Wetland Associated Birds	2	5	3	4	3	3	5	6	8	4
Suitability for Wetland Associated Mammals	1	4	3	5	4	2	3	6	9	4
Native Plant Richness	2	6	4	7	6	2	7	7	7	1
Primary Production and Export	N/A	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	9	N/A
<b>Notes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The numeric index represents the potential level of performance of a function on a scale of 0 to 10. Depressional closed wetlands always score a "10" for removing sediment, reducing peak flows, and reducing downstream erosion because they are closed systems with no outlets and are performing at their maximum because no sediment can leave the wetland. A "NA" indicator for anadromous fish or for production and export indicates that no outlets or flow through streams are present.</li> <li>Key for Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) Subclass identification: DC = Depressional Closed, DO = Depressional Outflow, RIV = Riverine Impounding, TF = Tidal Fringe.</li> </ul>										



**Table 2: Summary of Year 3 Function Assessments by Wetland ID number, Watershed, and HGM Subclass**

Wetland Name: Assessment Unit ID Number	38N1E11-24	38N1E11-23	38N1E11-13	38N1E11-01	38N1E11-03	38N1E11-02	38N2E19-04	38N1E04-09	38N1E04-04	38N1E04-10
Watershed ID	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	R	R	R
Hydrogeomorphic Subclass	DC	DO	DO	DO	DC	DC	DC	DO	DO	DC
Water Quality Functions										
Removing Sediment	10	5	5	6	10	10	10	4	5	10
Removing Nutrients	5	3	3	4	5	5	5	3	5	5
Removing Heavy Metals and Toxic Organics	6	5	4	6	5	6	4	4	6	5
Water Quantity Functions										
Reducing Peak Flows	10	4	6	4	10	10	10	4	4	10
Reducing Downstream Erosion	10	5	6	5	10	10	10	7	6	10
Recharging Ground Water	7	5	5	7	4	7	7	9	7	6
Habitat Suitability Functions										
General Habitat Suitability	2	3	5	2	4	2	5	7	6	2
Suitability for Invertebrates	1	3	4	1	4	1	5	5	5	2
Suitability for Amphibians	2	2	5	3	4	2	4	5	4	3
Suitability for Anadromous Fish	N/A	3	4	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	7	N/A
Suitability for Resident Fish	N/A	3	3	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	5	N/A
Suitability for Wetland Associated Birds	3	4	6	3	6	3	5	6	5	4
Suitability for Wetland Associated Mammals	3	6	4	2	4	3	4	6	6	5
Native Plant Richness	1	3	3	1	3	2	7	7	5	2
Primary Production and Export	N/A	7	8	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	8	N/A
<b>Notes:</b> • The numeric index represents the potential level of performance of a function on a scale of 0 to 10. Depressional closed wetlands always score a "10" for removing sediment, reducing peak flows, and reducing downstream erosion because they are closed systems with no outlets and are performing at their maximum because no sediment can leave the wetland. A "NA" indicator for anadromous fish or for production and export indicates that no outlets or flow through streams are present. • Key for Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) Subclass Identification: DC = Depressional Closed, DO = Depressional Outflow, RIV = Riverine Impounding, TF = Tidal Fringe.										

### **3.3 Results of Wetland Classification**

The Washington State Wetland Rating system was applied to twenty (20) assessment units on the Reservation. Table 3 presents the ratings for each AU.

Although none of the wetlands evaluated during this Year 3 inventory update effort were rated as Category 1 wetlands, it is anticipated that Category 1 wetlands may be encountered during future years of this study. Of the twenty (20) wetlands classified during Year 3, one (1) wetland was a Category 2 wetland, fifteen (15) were Category 3 wetlands, and four (4) wetlands were Category 4 wetlands.

The Washington State Wetland Rating system uses only the highest grouping in the HGM classification (i.e., wetland class). As summarized in Table 3, under the HGM classification system, all twenty (20) of the Reservation wetlands rated during Year 3 were depressional wetlands.

**Table 3 – Wetland Rating and HGM Classification**

<b>Wetland ID Number</b>	<b>Watershed Identification</b>	<b>Wetland Rating</b>	<b>HGM Class</b>
38N1E36-04	F	4	Depressional
38N1E25-03	F	3	Depressional
38N1E36-05	F	3	Depressional
38N1E36-02	F	3	Depressional
38N1E36-01	F	3	Depressional
38N1E23-08	G	3	Depressional
38N1E12-17	K	3	Depressional
38N1E12-18	K	3	Depressional
38N1E12-06	K	2	Depressional
38N1E11-04	K	3	Depressional
38N1E11-24	K	4	Depressional
38N1E11-23	K	3	Depressional
38N1E11-13	K	3	Depressional
38N1E11-01	K	4	Depressional
38N1E11-03	K	3	Depressional
38N1E11-02	K	3	Depressional
38N1E19-04	K	3	Depressional
38N1E04-09	R	3	Depressional
38N1E04-04	R	3	Depressional
38N1E04-10	R	4	Depressional

#### 4. DISCUSSION

Accurate information on the locations, functions, and wetland category is needed in order to effectively manage Reservation wetlands pursuant to the Lummi Nation Water Resources Protection Code (Title 17 of the Lummi Code of Laws [LCL]). Although the 1999 inventory represents an important planning tool and a significant improvement over the previously available information, it has proven to be too general for many planning efforts. Refining the spatial resolution of the wetland mapping, performing function assessments, and classifying the wetlands into the regulatory categories identified in Title 17 is intended to support efforts to protect these wetland resources and the important ecological, hydrological, and water quality protection functions that they provide. Because of the large number of wetland areas on the Reservation, the effort to refine the spatial resolution of the wetland mapping, to perform function assessments, and to classify the Reservation wetlands is projected to require several years to complete. This report summarizes the results of the third year of this inventory update effort.


The overall result of the inventory update effort will be a more accurate GIS data layer and an associated database that contains the classification and other summary information on each wetland on the Reservation. Hard copies of field notes (e.g., function assessment work sheets, wetland rating worksheets, location maps) are maintained in binders in the Lummi Water Resources Division office. Until the update effort is completed, the GIS data layer and associated database will be a work in progress. The current version of the Lummi Reservation Wetland Map is shown in Figure 4. Figure 4 shows the information in Figure 3 except that the 1999 wetland locations that were revised during Year 1 through Year 3 of this update effort have been removed.

As described previously, Year 3 of this inventory update resulted in revising the locations and extent of twenty (20) wetlands, collecting additional information on the functions of twenty (20) wetlands, and classifying twenty (20) wetlands into one of four categories. Based on the changes to the spatial locations and the utility of the collected information on wetland function and category, the inventory update should continue until it is completed. However, because of the amount of time and resources required to complete the inventory update using the current approach, the Water Resources Manager is considering modifying the approach to eliminate the time consuming wetland function assessment element of the inventory update. The modification being considered will retain the effort to improve the spatial resolution of the Reservation wetland inventory and the effort to classify/rate the Reservation wetlands into one of four categories to support the implementation of Title 17 and the associated determination of the appropriate buffer width. Wetland function assessments will be deferred until a development action is planned that will impact a wetland and a function assessment is required to determine appropriate mitigation for unavoidable wetland impacts. The modification is anticipated to allow more of the

Reservation wetlands to be visited during a year and to accelerate the completion of the inventory update.

Future phases of this study will include estuarine wetlands, which are Category 1 wetlands if they are relatively undisturbed and are larger than one acre. Estuarine wetlands are not included in the classes of wetlands that are covered by the WAFAM method at this time, so a different method will need to be used, or the evaluation of these wetlands delayed until the methodology is developed.

**Figure 4 - Best Available Wetland Inventory Map (November 2007)**



— Roads     Wetland  
 Parcels     Wetland Complex

0    0.5    1    2 Miles






## 5. REFERENCES

- Brinson, M.M. 1993. A Hydrogeomorphic Classification for Wetlands. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. Wetlands Research Program Technical Report WRP-DE-4.
- Cooke, S.S. 2000. Wetland and Buffer Functions Semi-Quantitative Assessment Methodology. Cooke Scientific Services. Seattle, WA.
- Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deepwater habitats of the United States. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Publication No. FWS/OBS-79/31.
- Harper, K. 1999. Comprehensive Wetland Inventory of the Lummi Reservation. Sheldon and Associates, Inc. Seattle Washington.
- Hruby, T, T. Granger, K. Brunner, S. Cooke, K. Dublanica, R. Gersib, L. Reinelt, K. Richter, D. Sheldon, E. Teachout, A. Wald, and F. Weinmann. July 1999. Methods for Assessing Wetland Functions Volume 1: Riverine and Depressional Wetlands in the Lowlands of Western Washington. WA State Department of Ecology Publication #99-115. Olympia, Washington.
- Hruby, T. 2004. Washington State wetland rating system for Western Washington – Revised. Washington State Department of Ecology Publication #04-06-025.
- Lummi Water Resources Division (LWRD). 1997. Lummi Nation Wellhead Protection Program --Phase I. Prepared for Lummi Indian Business Council. Lummi Reservation, Washington. November.
- Lummi Water Resources Division (LWRD). 1998. Lummi Nation Wellhead Protection Program --Phase II. Prepared for Lummi Indian Business Council. Lummi Reservation, Washington.
- Lummi Water Resources Division (LWRD). 1998. Lummi Reservation Storm Water Management Program Technical Background Document. Prepared for Lummi Indian Business Council. Lummi Reservation, Washington. December.
- Lummi Water Resources Division (LWRD). 2000. Lummi Indian Reservation Wetland Management Program. Prepared for Lummi Indian Business Council. Lummi Reservation, Washington. March.

- Lummi Water Resources Division (LWRD). 2001. Lummi Nation Non-Point Source Assessment Report. Prepared for Lummi Indian Business Council. Lummi Reservation, Washington. December.
- Lummi Water Resources Division (LWRD). 2002. Lummi Nation Non-Point Source Management Plan. Prepared for Lummi Indian Business Council. Lummi Reservation, Washington. January.
- Lummi Water Resources Division (LWRD). 2005. Lummi Nation Wetland Inventory Update Year 1 Synthesis Report. Prepared for Lummi Indian Business Council. Lummi Reservation, Washington. December.
- Lummi Water Resources Division (LWRD). 2006. Lummi Nation Wetland Inventory Update Year 2 Synthesis Report. Prepared for Lummi Indian Business Council. Lummi Reservation, Washington. December.
- Lummi Water Resources Division (LWRD). 2007. Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the Lummi Indian Reservation. Prepared for Lummi Indian Business Council. Lummi Reservation, Washington. August.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE). 1987. "Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual," Technical Report Y-87-1, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture-Soil Conservation Service (USDA). 1992. Soil Survey of Whatcom County Area, Washington.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1987. National Wetlands Inventory. Washington, D.C.
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (Ecology) 1991. Washington State Wetlands Rating System for Western Washington. Olympia, WA Publ. #91-57

## **APPENDIX A – INDIVIDUAL WETLAND MAPS**


# 38N1E36-04, 38N1E25-03, 38N1E36-05, 38N1E36-02, and 38N1E36-01



## Wetlands

-  Updated 2005
-  Updated 2006
-  Updated 2007
-  Wetland (Estimated 1999)
-  Wetland Complex (Estimated 1999)

-  Approximate Channel Location
-  Approximate Parcel Boundary




Lummi Nation makes no claim as to the accuracy, completeness, or content of any data contained herein. This map is not intended to reflect the extent of land boundaries of the Lummi Reservation. All warranties of fitness for a particular purpose and of merchantability are hereby disclaimed.





38N1E23-08



**Wetlands**

-  Updated 2005
-  Updated 2006
-  Updated 2007
-  Wetland (Estimated 1999)
-  Wetland Complex (Estimated 1999)

 Approximate Channel Location

 Approximate Parcel Boundary


0 250 500  
Feet

Lummi Nation makes no claim as to the accuracy, completeness, or content of any data contained herein. This map is not intended to reflect the extent of land boundaries of the Lummi Reservation. All warranties of fitness for a particular purpose and of merchantability are hereby disclaimed.





# 38N1E12-17 and 38N1E12-18




## Wetlands

- Updated 2005
- Updated 2006
- Updated 2007
- Wetland (Estimated 1999)
- Wetland Complex (Estimated 1999)

- Approximate Channel Location
- Approximate Parcel Boundary


0 250 500  
Feet

Lummi Nation makes no claim as to the accuracy, completeness, or content of any data contained herein. This map is not intended to reflect the extent of land boundaries of the Lummi Reservation. All warranties of fitness for a particular purpose and of merchantability are hereby disclaimed.





38N1E12-06



### Wetlands

-  Updated 2005
-  Updated 2006
-  Updated 2007
-  Wetland (Estimated 1999)
-  Wetland Complex (Estimated 1999)

 Approximate Channel Location

 Approximate Parcel Boundary


0 250 500  
Feet

Lummi Nation makes no claim as to the accuracy, completeness, or content of any data contained herein. This map is not intended to reflect the extent of land boundaries of the Lummi Reservation. All warranties of fitness for a particular purpose and of merchantability are hereby disclaimed.





## 38N1E11-04 and 38N1E11-23




### Wetlands

- Updated 2005
- Updated 2006
- Updated 2007
- Wetland (Estimated 1999)
- Wetland Complex (Estimated 1999)

- Approximate Channel Location
- Approximate Parcel Boundary


0 250 500  
Feet

Lummi Nation makes no claim as to the accuracy, completeness, or content of any data contained herein. This map is not intended to reflect the extent of land boundaries of the Lummi Reservation. All warranties of fitness for a particular purpose and of merchantability are hereby disclaimed.





# 38N1E11-01, 38N1E11-24, 38N1E11-02, and 38N1E11-03



## Wetlands

- Updated 2005
- Updated 2006
- Updated 2007
- Wetland (Estimated 1999)
- Wetland Complex (Estimated 1999)

Approximate Channel Location

Approximate Parcel Boundary


0 250 500  
Feet

Lummi Nation makes no claim as to the accuracy, completeness, or content of any data contained herein. This map is not intended to reflect the extent of land boundaries of the Lummi Reservation. All warranties of fitness for a particular purpose and of merchantability are hereby disclaimed.







# 38N1E11-13



## Wetlands

-  Updated 2005
-  Updated 2006
-  Updated 2007
-  Wetland (Estimated 1999)
-  Wetland Complex (Estimated 1999)

-  Approximate Channel Location
-  Approximate Parcel Boundary


0 250 500  
Feet

Lummi Nation makes no claim as to the accuracy, completeness, or content of any data contained herein. This map is not intended to reflect the extent of land boundaries of the Lummi Reservation. All warranties of fitness for a particular purpose and of merchantability are hereby disclaimed.





38N1E19-04



**Wetlands**

-  Updated 2005
-  Updated 2006
-  Updated 2007
-  Wetland (Estimated 1999)
-  Wetland Complex (Estimated 1999)

 Approximate Channel Location

 Approximate Parcel Boundary


0 250 500  
Feet

Lummi Nation makes no claim as to the accuracy, completeness, or content of any data contained herein. This map is not intended to reflect the extent of land boundaries of the Lummi Reservation. All warranties of fitness for a particular purpose and of merchantability are hereby disclaimed.







# 38N1E04-10 and 38N1E04-09



## Wetlands

-  Updated 2005
-  Updated 2006
-  Updated 2007
-  Wetland (Estimated 1999)
-  Wetland Complex (Estimated 1999)

-  Approximate Channel Location
-  Approximate Parcel Boundary


0 250 500  
Feet

Lummi Nation makes no claim as to the accuracy, completeness, or content of any data contained herein. This map is not intended to reflect the extent of land boundaries of the Lummi Reservation. All warranties of fitness for a particular purpose and of merchantability are hereby disclaimed.





38N1E04-04



**Wetlands**


-  Updated 2005
-  Updated 2006
-  Updated 2007
-  Wetland (Estimated 1999)
-  Wetland Complex (Estimated 1999)

 Approximate Channel Location

 Approximate Parcel Boundary

0 250 500  
Feet

Lummi Nation makes no claim as to the accuracy, completeness, or content of any data contained herein. This map is not intended to reflect the extent of land boundaries of the Lummi Reservation. All warranties of fitness for a particular purpose and of merchantability are hereby disclaimed.





## **APPENDIX B – SAMPLE FIELD NOTES AND FUNCTION ASSESSMENT AND WETLAND RATING WORKSHEETS**

"Fitness Center Wetland" 3801  
 "new wetland" with new name K

Wetland Name: 38NIE12-17

Location: N. of Fitness Center

Data Collector: Lee First

AU ID#:

T/S/R:

Date: 10/3/07

Use this data sheet for:

**DEPRESSIONAL CLOSED** wetlands  
 in the Lowlands of Western Washington

- Use in conjunction with the written guidance provided in Parts 1 and 2
- Record only numbers, yes/no answers are recorded as a [1] or [0]

Mapped 10/3/07  
 Ratings: 10/9/07

Estimate,  
 Score/ or Rating

#### LANDSCAPE DATA

Do dikes surround the AU, and does it drain through a control structure that can be manipulated?

- |      |     |      |   |
|------|-----|------|---|
| 0    | 1/0 | D0   | Area of AU  |
| 1.35 | ha  | D1   | Area of contributing basin (upgradient watershed)   |
| 4.6  | ha  | D2   | Land use (as % of total area) within 1 km of AU (include contiguous AUs of different class) |
|      |     | D3   | Undeveloped forest (if previously clear-cut, cut at least 5 years ago)                      |
| 60   | %   | D3.1 | Agriculture (tilled fields and pastures; includes golf courses)                             |
| 10   | %   | D3.2 | Clear-cut logging (<5 years since clearing)   |
| 0    | %   | D3.3 | Urban/commercial (any developed areas not identified as residential)                        |
| 5    | %   | D3.4 | High density residential (>1 residence/acre)  |
| 5    | %   | D3.5 | Low density residential (<= 1 residence/acre)   |
| 20   | %   | D3.7 | Undeveloped areas, shrubland, other wetlands, and open water                                |

inc. piped drainage from LIBC  
 - 500 x 1000'

LIBC + NWIC

#### WATER REGIME

- |     |     |      |  |
|-----|-----|------|--|
|     |     | D4   |  |
|     |     | D4.1 |  |
|     |     | D4.2 |  |
|     |     | D4.3 |  |
|     |     | D5   |  |
|     |     | D6   |  |
|     |     | D7   |  |
|     |     | D8   | <u>Inundation</u>  |
| 100 | %   | D8.1 | Percent of AU that is ponded or inundated for >1 month                   |
| 0   | %   | D8.2 | Percent of AU with permanent standing or moving water                    |
| 0   | %   | D8.3 | Percent of AU with permanent open water (without aquatic bed vegetation) |
| 0   | %   | D8.4 | Percent of AU with unvegetated bars or mudflats                          |
| 0   | 0/1 | D8.5 | Unvegetated bars or mudflats at least 100 square meters in size          |
|     |     | D9   | <u>Inundation regimes</u>  |
| 0   | 0/1 | D9.1 | Permanently flooded (include vegetated areas)                            |
| 1   | 0/1 | D9.2 | Seasonally flooded (>1 month)  |
| 0   | 0/1 | D9.3 | Occasionally flooded (<= 1 month)  |
| 1   | 0/1 | D9.4 | Saturated but seldom inundated   |
| 0   | 0/1 | D9.5 | Permanently flowing stream   |
| 0   | 0/1 | D9.6 | Intermittently flowing stream  |
|     | m   | D10  |  |

By definition:  
 D8.1 >= D8.2 >= D8.3

Chose all that apply that meet size  
 criteria: area >0.1 ha (1/4 acre) or  
 > 10% of AU if AU smaller than 1 ha  
 (2.5 acres)

No outlet; inlet only

# DEPRESSIONAL CLOSED

Wetland Name: 38N1E12-17

AU ID#:

D11	
0/1	D11.1
0/1	D11.2
0/1	D11.3
D12 <u>Categories of water depths</u> in AU, areas permanently or seasonally inundated/flooded	
<u>1</u>	0/1 D12.1 1-20 cm (<8 in)
<u>0</u>	0/1 D12.2 20-100 cm (8-40 in)
<u>0</u>	0/1 D12.3 >100 cm (>40 in)
D13	
D13.1	
D13.2	
D13.3	
D13.4	
VEGETATION	
D14 <u>Cowardin Classes</u> (as % area of AU)	
<u>0</u>	% D14.1 Forest - evergreen
<u>90</u>	% D14.2 Forest - deciduous
<u>0</u>	% D14.3 Scrub-shrub - evergreen
<u>0</u>	% D14.4 Scrub-shrub - deciduous
<u>10</u>	% D14.5 Emergent <i>Emergent areas</i>
<u>0</u>	% D14.6 Aquatic bed <i>overstipped by canopy</i>
<u>1</u>	0/1 D15 Does D8.3 + D8.4 + sum (D14.1 to D14.6) = 100? If not, give reason.
<u>20</u>	% D16 <u>% area of herbaceous understory</u> in forest and shrub areas (not % area in entire AU)
<u>30</u>	% D17 <u>% area of AU with &gt;75% closure of canopy</u> (SS, FO classes > 1 m high)
D18	
D19 <u>Plant Richness</u>	
<u>19</u>	# D19.1 Record number of native plant species found in AU
<u>1</u>	# D19.2 Record number of non- native plant species found in AU
<u>5</u>	# D20 <u>The # of plant assemblages</u> in the AU with area >0.1 ha (1/4 acre) or >10% if AU <1 ha (if more than 12 record a 12)
<u>3</u>	[1-6] D21 <u>Strata:</u> The maximum # of strata present in any plant assemblage
<u>0</u>	0/1 D21.1 Is vine stratum dominated by non-native blackberries?
<u>1</u>	0/1 D22 <u>Mature trees in AU</u>

Record a 1 for each category present if >0.1 ha (1/4 acre) or 10% of area

- Include forest only if trees are rooted in AU.
- If forest is a mix of deciduous and evergreen estimate the relative % cover of each and divide percentage between the two categories.
- If vegetation classes are patchy, add the patches together for each class to get a total.
- To count, a class must cover at least 0.1 ha or be more than 10% of the total area of the AU

A stratum must have 20% cover in assemblage

Average DBH of 3 out of 5 largest trees of a species has to exceed size threshold

- Tsuga heterophylla* (western hemlock) >45 cm (18")
- Thuja plicata* (western red cedar) >45 cm (18")
- Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Douglas fir) >45 cm (18")
- Picea sitchensis* (Sitka spruce) >45 cm (18")
- Populus balsamifera* (black cottonwood) >45 cm (18") ✓
- Acer macrophyllum* (big-leaf maple) >45 cm (18")
- Alnus rubra* (red alder) >30 cm (12") ✓
- Fraxinus latifolia* (Oregon ash) >30 cm (12")
- Pinus contorta* (lodgepole pine) >30 cm (12")
- Salix lucida* (Pacific willow) >30 cm (12")


# DEPRESSIONAL CLOSED

Wetland Name:	38N1E12-17	AU ID#:	
---------------	------------	---------	--


- 0 0/1 D23 Sphagnum bogs
- 0 0/1 D23.1 % area of Sphagnum bog >75%
- 0 0/1 D23.2 % area of Sphagnum bog = 50-75%
- 0 0/1 D23.3 % area of Sphagnum bog = 25-49%
- 0 0/1 D23.4 % area of Sphagnum bog = 1-24%
- 1 0/1 D23.5 % area of Sphagnum bog = 0%
- 0 0/1 D24 Dominance by non-native plant species
- 0 0/1 D24.1 % area of non-native species >75%
- 0 0/1 D24.2 % area of non-native species = 50-75%
- 0 0/1 D24.3 % area of non-native species = 25-49%
- 1 0/1 D24.4 % area of non-native species = 1-24%
- 0 0/1 D24.5 % area of non-natives = 0%

## HABITAT CHARACTERISTICS

- 0 [0-3] D25 Number of structure categories in aquatic bed vegetation  
*Applies only to aquatic bed species*  
*DO NOT count persistent emergents*



- 7 D26 pH
- 7 [4-9] D26.1 pH of interstitial water (*measure immediately after digging hole in non-inundated areas*)
- 7 [4-9] D26.2 pH of open or standing water (*record the lowest pH, if you cannot measure record a [7]*)
- 1 0/1 D27 Estuary: AU is within 8 km (5 mi) of a brackish or salt water estuary
- 0 0/1 D28 Large lake: AU is within 1.6km (1 mi) of a lake >8 ha (20 acres)
- 1 0/1 D29 Open field: AU is within 5 km (3 mi) of an open field (agriculture or pasture) >16 ha (40 acres)
- 1 0/1 D30 Preferred woody vegetation: AU has >1 ha (2.5 acres) of preferred woody vegetation for beaver in and within 100 m of AU
- 3 [0-8] D31 Snags (record # of stages)  
*Circle the categories present; minimum DBH of snag = 10 cm (4")*



- 0 0/1 D31.1 At least one of the snags above has a DBH greater than 30 cm (12").

DEPRESSIONAL CLOSED

Wetland Name: 38N1E12-17 AU ID#:

0 0/1 D32 Overhanging vegetation, extending out for 1 m, for at least 10 m (33 ft) over stream or open water.

0 0/1 D33 Upland islands of at least 10 square meters (100 square ft.) within AU boundary  
Islands need to be surrounded by at least 30 m (100 ft) of open water deeper than 1 m (3 ft)

D34

1 [0-4] D35 Key for rating egg-laying structures for amphibians

1. Does the AU have thin-stemmed vegetation or thin branches (<8 mm) in at least 1/4 acre (or 10% of AU) of permanent or seasonally inundated areas? Thin-stemmed vegetation can include herbaceous species such as water parsley.

NO - Score = 0

YES go to 2

2. Does the AU have at least 0.2 ha (1/2 acre) of thin-stemmed emergent vegetation or woody branches, 1-4 mm in diameter?

NO go to 5

YES go to 3

3. Does the area with thin stems contain open water interspersed in a patchwork of a ratio that is approximately 1:1 [no more than a 40- 60% of the total area is open water)?

NO go to 4

YES - Score = 4

4. Is the area of open water between 25% and 75% of the total area in the zone of thin stemmed vegetation?

NO - Score = 2

YES - Score = 3 STOP

5. Does the AU have >0.1 ha (1/4 acre) of thin-stemmed emergent vegetation or woody branches, 1-4 mm?

NO - Score = 1

YES go to 6

6. Does the area with thin stems contain open water interspersed in a patchwork of a ratio that is approximately 1:1 [no more than a 40- 60% of the total area is open water)?

NO go to 7

YES - Score = 3

7. Is the area of open water between 25% and 75% of the total area in the zone of thin stemmed vegetation?

NO - Score = 1

YES - Score = 2

0 0/1 D36 Tannins in surface waters >10% of water surface

0 0/1 D37 Steep banks for denning (>30 degree slope, fine material, >10 m long, >0.6 m high) (may be a dike)

0 [0-3] D38 Interspersion between erect vegetation and permanent open water (POW + AB) areas of AU



None [0]



Low [1]



Low [1]



Low [1]



Moderate [2]



Moderate [2]



High [3]



High [3]

NO perm. open water



# DEPRESSIONAL CLOSED


Wetland Name: 38N1E12-17

AU ID#:

[0-3] D39

Interspersion between Cowardin vegetation classes

- \*AUs with only 2 classes can only score a moderate [2] or lower
- \*AUs with 4 vegetation classes score a high [3]
- \*AUs with 3 classes can score a moderate (2) or a high (3)



D40

0

[0-3] D41

**Edge of AU:** The characteristics of the edge between AU and uplands or adjacent wetlands.  
Choose the description that best fits the characteristics of the AU edge:

- There are no differences in level of vegetation height as reflected by vegetation classes on each side of the AU for more than 50% of the circumference: record a [0] regardless of the sinuosity.  
Examples: emergent (or herbaceous) to emergent (or herbaceous), shrub to shrub, forest to forest.
- There is a difference of one level in vegetation height as reflected by vegetation classes on each side of the AU and the edge is straight for more than 50% of the circumference: record a [1]. Example: emergent (or herbaceous) to shrub, shrub to forest.
- There is a difference of one level in vegetation height as reflected by vegetation classes on each side of the AU and the edge is sinuous for more than 50% of the circumference: record a [2]. Examples: emergent (or herbaceous) to shrub, shrub to forest.
- There is a difference of more than one level of vegetation height as reflected by vegetation classes on each side of the AU and the edge is straight: record a [2]. Examples: emergent (or herbaceous) to forest, bryophytes to scrub/shrub or forest.
- There is a difference of more than one level of vegetation height as reflected by vegetation classes on each side of the AU and the edge is sinuous: record a [3]. Example: emergent (or herbaceous) to forest, bryophytes to scrub/shrub or forest.
- If no single category above extends for more than 50% of the circumference, and the edge is straight: record a [2]
- If no single category above extends for more than 50% of the circumference, and the edge is sinuous: record a [3]

# DEPRESSIONAL CLOSED

Wetland Name: 38N1E12-17

AU ID#:

3 [0-5] D42

Buffer of AU: Choose the description that best represents condition of AU buffer

\* Open water or adjacent wetlands are considered part of the buffer  
 \* Infrequently used gravel or paved roads or vegetated dikes in a relatively undisturbed buffer can be ignored as a "disturbance"

- 5 100 m (330 ft) of forest, scrub, relatively undisturbed grassland or open water >95% of circumference. Clear-cut >5 years old is OK. No developed areas within undisturbed part of buffer.
- 4 100 m (330 ft) of forest, scrub, relatively undisturbed grassland or open water >50% circumference OR 50 m (170 ft) of forest scrub, grassland or open water >95% circumference. No developed areas within undisturbed part of buffer.
- 3 100 m (330 ft) of forest, scrub, grassland or open water >25% circumference, OR 50 m (170 ft) of forest, scrub, grassland or open water >50% circumference.
- 2 No paved areas or buildings within 25m (80 ft) of wetland >95% circumference. Pasture or lawns are OK. OR no paved areas or buildings within 50m of wetland >50% circumference
- 0 Vegetated buffers are <2 m wide (6.6 ft) for more than 95% of the circumference
- 1 Does not meet any of the criteria above

7 [0-3] D43

Corridors of AU: Rate corridors using following key (record rating of 0, 1, 2, or 3)

1. Is the AU part of a riparian corridor (see text for definitions)  
☒ NO go to 5      YES go to 2
2. Is the wetland part of riparian corridor >50 m wide connecting 2 or more wetlands within 1 km with at least 30% shrub or forest cover in the corridor?  
 NO go to 3      YES = [3]
3. Is the AU part of a riparian corridor 25-50 m wide connecting to other wetlands with at least 30% shrub or forest cover in the corridor?  
 NO go to 4      YES = [2]
4. Is the AU part of a riparian corridor >5 m wide with relatively undisturbed veg. (grasslands, abandoned pasture are OK) that extends for more than 1 km?  
 NO go to 5      YES = [1]
5. Is there a corridor >50 m wide with good (>30%) cover of forest or shrub (>2 m high) to natural upland area or open water that is >100 ha in size?  
☒ NO go to 6      YES = [3]
6. Is there a 10-50 m wide forest or shrub corridor to a relatively undisturbed upland or open water that is >10 ha?  
 NO go to 7      YES = ☒ [2]
7. Is there a corridor of relatively undisturbed vegetation (grassland, abandoned pasture) >50 m wide to an undisturbed upland or open water that is >10 ha?  
 NO go to 8      YES = [2]
8. Is there any vegetated corridor 5-50 m wide between the AU and any relatively undisturbed area or open water that is >2.5 ha?  
 NO = [0]      YES = [1]



# DEPRESSIONAL CLOSED

Wetland Name:

38N1E12-17

AU ID#:

5 [0-12] D44

# of categories of large woody debris in AU outside of perm. water

Freshly cut  
stumps are  
not included

Diameter  
10-20cm (4-8")  
21-50cm (8-20")  
>50 cm (>20")

Log Class 1

✓

Log Class 2

✓

Log Class 3

✓
✓
✓

Stump


0 [0-12] D45

# of categories of large woody debris in permanent water of AU (may include aquatic bed areas)

no perm water


Diameter  
10-20cm (4-8")  
21-50cm (8-20")  
>50 cm (>20")

Log Class 1


Log Class 2


Log Class 3


Stump


## SOILS and SUBSTRATES

D46 Composition of AU surface

1	0/1	D46.1	Deciduous, broad-leaved, leaf litter
0	0/1	D46.2	Other plant litter
1	0/1	D46.3	Decomposed organic
0	0/1	D46.4	Exposed cobbles
0	0/1	D46.5	Exposed gravel
0	0/1	D46.6	Exposed sand
0	0/1	D46.7	Exposed silt
0	0/1	D46.8	Exposed clay

D47 Soils present in top (15 cm) of A horizon (record [1] if 1-49% area of AU, [2] if 50-95%, [3] if &gt;95%)

0	[0-3]	D47.1	Peat
0	[0-3]	D47.2	Organic Muck
3	[0-3]	D47.3	Mineral with clay fraction <30%
0	[0-3]	D47.4	Clay (clay fraction >30%)

Record a 1 for each category present if its area is &gt; 10 square meters. Note: bare earth from animal tunnels does NOT count.

Record the least permeable layer if there are several down to 60 cm.

**DEPRESSIONAL CLOSED**

<b>Wetland Name:</b> 38N1E12-17		<b>AU ID#:</b>
	<b>D48</b>	<b>Infiltration rate</b> of top 60 cm of soil in seasonally inundated areas
<u>0</u>	0/1 <b>D48.1</b>	Fast >50% gravel and cobble and the rest a sand, loamy sand, or sandy loam
<u>0</u>	0/1 <b>D48.2</b>	Moderate >50% sand and rest cobble, gravel, loamy sand, or sandy loam
<u>1</u>	0/1 <b>D48.3</b>	Slow - muck, peat, or loams (except sandy loam), silts, and clays
	<b>D49</b>	
	<b>D49.1</b>	
	<b>D49.2</b>	
	<b>D49.3</b>	

**Judgements of Opportunity (Ratings of High, Medium, Low)**

Rating	Functions
<u>L</u>	Removing Sediments
<u>L</u>	Removing Nutrients
<u>H</u>	Removing Toxic Metals and Organics (parking lot runoff)
<u>M</u>	Reducing Peak Flows
<u>L</u>	Reducing Downstream Erosion
<u>M</u>	Recharging Groundwater
<u>L</u>	General Habitat
<u>L</u>	Anadromous Fish Habitat

## WETLAND RATING FORM - WESTERN WASHINGTON

Name of wetland (if known): 38N1E12-17  
N. of Lummi Fitness Center  
 Location: SEC:      TOWNSHIP:      RANGE:      (attach map with outline of wetland to rating form)  
 Person(s) Rating Wetland: Lee First Affiliation: LNR Date of site visit: 10/3/07

## SUMMARY OF RATING

Category based on FUNCTIONS provided by wetland

I      II      III      IV     

Category I = Score  $\geq 70$   
 Category II = Score 51-69  
 Category III = Score 30-50  
 Category IV = Score  $< 30$

Score for Water Quality Functions

20

Score for Hydrologic Functions

10

Score for Habitat Functions

14

TOTAL score for functions

44

Category based on SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS of wetland

I      II      Does not Apply     

Final Category (choose the "highest" category from above)

III

Check the appropriate type and class of wetland being rated.

Wetland Type	Wetland Class	
Estuarine	Depressional	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Natural Heritage Wetland	Riverine	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bog	Lake-fringe	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mature Forest	Slope	<input type="checkbox"/>
Old Growth Forest	Flats	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coastal Lagoon	Freshwater Tidal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interdunal		<input type="checkbox"/>
None of the above		<input type="checkbox"/>

WATER QUALITY FUNCTIONS - Indicators that wetland functions to improve water quality				
D	D 1. Does the wetland have the <u>potential</u> to improve water quality? (see p. 38)			
D	D 1.1 Characteristics of surface water flows out of the wetland: Wetland is a depression with no surface water outlet points = 3 Wetland has an intermittently flowing, or highly constricted, outlet points = 2 Wetland has an unconstricted surface outlet points = 1 Wetland is flat and has no obvious outlet and/or outlet is a ditch points = 1		3	
D	D 1.2 The soil 2 inches below the surface is clay, organic, or smells anoxic (hydrogen sulfide or rotten eggs). YES points = 4 NO points = 0		0	
D	D 1.3 Characteristics of persistent vegetation (emergent, shrub, and/or forest class): Wetland has persistent, ungrazed, vegetation > = 95% of area points = 5 Wetland has persistent, ungrazed, vegetation > = 1/2 of area points = 3 Wetland has persistent, ungrazed vegetation > = 1/10 of area points = 1 Wetland has persistent, ungrazed vegetation < 1/10 of area points = 0		5	
D	D1.4 Characteristics of seasonal ponding or inundation. <i>This is the area of the wetland that is ponded for at least 2 months, but dries out sometime during the year. Do not count the area that is permanently ponded. Estimate area as the average condition 5 out of 10 yrs.</i> Area seasonally ponded is > 1/2 total area of wetland points = 4 Area seasonally ponded is > 1/4 total area of wetland points = 2 Area seasonally ponded is < 1/4 total area of wetland points = 0 NOTE: See text for indicators of seasonal and permanent inundation..		2	
D	Total for D 1 Add the points in the boxes above		10	
D	D 2. Does the wetland have the <u>opportunity</u> to improve water quality? (see p. 44) Answer YES if you know or believe there are pollutants in groundwater or surface water coming into the wetland that would otherwise reduce water quality in streams, lakes or groundwater downgradient from the wetland? Note which of the following conditions provide the sources of pollutants. — Grazing in the wetland or within 150 ft No — Untreated stormwater discharges to wetland yes — Tilled fields or orchards within 150 ft of wetland no — A stream or culvert discharges into wetland that drains developed areas, residential areas, farmed fields, roads, or clear-cut logging yes — Residential, urban areas, golf courses are within 150 ft of wetland — Wetland is fed by groundwater high in phosphorus or nitrogen — Other YES multiplier is 2 NO multiplier is 1		multiplier	2
D	<b>TOTAL - Water Quality Functions</b> Multiply the score from D1 by D2 Add score to table on p. 1		20	



HYDROLOGIC FUNCTIONS - Indicators that wetland functions to reduce flooding and stream degradation		
	<b>D 3. Does the wetland have the <u>potential</u> to reduce flooding and erosion?</b> (see p. 46)	
D	<b>D 3.1 Characteristics of surface water flows out of the wetland</b> Wetland has no surface water outlet points = 4 Wetland has an intermittently flowing, or highly constricted, outlet points = 2 Wetland is flat and has no obvious outlet and/or outlet is a small ditch points = 1 Wetland has an unconstricted surface outlet points = 0	4
D	<b>D 3.2 Depth of storage during wet periods</b> <i>Estimate the height of ponding above the bottom of the outlet</i> Marks of ponding are 3 ft or more above the surface points = 7 The wetland is a "headwater" wetland points = 5 Marks of ponding between 2 ft to < 3 ft from surface points = 5 Marks are at least 0.5 ft to < 2 ft from surface points = 3 Wetland is flat but has small depressions on the surface that trap water points = 1 Marks of ponding less than 0.5 ft points = 0	1
D	<b>D 3.3 Contribution of wetland to storage in the watershed</b> <i>Estimate the ratio of the area of upstream basin contributing surface water to the wetland to the area of the wetland itself.</i> The area of the basin is less than 10 times the area of wetland points = 5 The area of the basin is 10 to 100 times the area of the wetland points = 3 The area of the basin is more than 100 times the area of the wetland points = 0 Wetland is in the FLATS class (basin = the wetland, by definition) points = 5	5
D	<b>Total for D 3</b> Add the points in the boxes above	10
D	<b>D 4. Does the wetland have the <u>opportunity</u> to reduce flooding and erosion?</b> (see p. 49) Answer YES if the wetland is in a location in the watershed where the flood storage, or reduction in water velocity, it provides helps protect downstream property and aquatic resources from flooding or excessive and/or erosive flows. Answer NO if the water coming into the wetland is controlled by a structure such as flood gate, tide gate, flap valve, reservoir etc. OR you estimate that more than 90% of the water in the wetland is from groundwater. Note which of the following indicators of opportunity apply. — Wetland is in a headwater of a river or stream that has flooding problems — Wetland drains to a river or stream that has flooding problems — Wetland has no outlet and impounds surface runoff water that might otherwise flow into a river or stream that has flooding problems — Other _____ YES multiplier is 2      NO multiplier is 1	multiplier 1
D	<b>TOTAL - Hydrologic Functions</b> Multiply the score from D 3 by D 4 Add score to table on p. 1	10

## HABITAT FUNCTIONS - Indicators that wetland functions to provide important habitat

### H 1. Does the wetland have the potential to provide habitat for many species?

#### H 1.1 Vegetation structure (see p. 72)

Check the types of vegetation classes present (as defined by Cowardin) if the class covers more than 10% of the area of the wetland or 1/4 acre.

☐ Aquatic bed

☒ Emergent plants

☐ Scrub/shrub (areas where shrubs have >30% cover)

☒ Forested (areas where trees have >30% cover)

☐ Forested areas have 3 out of 5 strata (canopy, sub-canopy, shrubs, herbaceous, moss/ground-cover)

Add the number of vegetation types that qualify. If you have:

4 types or more                      points = 4

3 types                                  points = 2

2 types                                  points = 1

1 type                                   points = 0

#### H 1.2. Hydroperiods (see p. 73)

Check the types of water regimes (hydroperiods) present within the wetland. The water regime has to cover more than 10% of the wetland or 1/4 acre to count. (see text for descriptions of hydroperiods)

☐ Permanently flooded or inundated                      4 or more types present                      points = 3

☒ Seasonally flooded or inundated                      3 types present                      points = 2

☐ Occasionally flooded or inundated                      2 types present                      point = 1

☒ Saturated only

☐ Permanently flowing stream or river in, or adjacent to, the wetland

☐ Seasonally flowing stream in, or adjacent to, the wetland

☐ Lake-fringe wetland = 2 points

☐ Freshwater tidal wetland = 2 points

#### H 1.3. Richness of Plant Species (see p. 75)

Count the number of plant species in the wetland that cover at least 10 ft<sup>2</sup>. (different patches of the same species can be combined to meet the size threshold)

You do not have to name the species.

Do not include Eurasian Milfoil, reed canarygrass, purple loosestrife, Canadian Thistle

If you counted:                      > 19 species                      points = 2

List species below if you want to:                      5 - 19 species                      points = 1

< 5 species                              points = 0

**H 1.4. Interspersion of habitats (see p. 76)**


Decide from the diagrams below whether interspersion between types of vegetation (described in H 1.1), or vegetation types and unvegetated areas (can include open water or mudflats) is high, medium, low, or none.



None = 0 points

Low = 1 point

Moderate = 2 points



High = 3 points

[riparian braided channels]

NOTE: If you have four or more vegetation types or three vegetation types and open water the rating is always "high".

**H 1.5. Special Habitat Features: (see p. 77)**

Check the habitat features that are present in the wetland. The number of checks is the number of points you put into the next column.

- ☒ Large, downed, woody debris within the wetland (>4in. diameter and 6 ft long).
- ☒ Standing snags (diameter at the bottom > 4 inches) in the wetland
- ☐ Undercut banks are present for at least 6.6 ft (2m) and/or overhanging vegetation extends at least 3.3 ft (1m) over a stream for at least 33 ft (10m)
- ☐ Stable steep banks of fine material that might be used by beaver or muskrat for denning (>30degree slope) OR signs of recent beaver activity are present
- ☒ At least ¼ acre of thin-stemmed persistent vegetation or woody branches are present in areas that are permanently or seasonally inundated. (structures for egg-laying by amphibians)
- ☐ Invasive plants cover less than 25% of the wetland area in each stratum of plants

**H 1. TOTAL Score - potential for providing habitat**  
Add the scores in the column above

Comments



<b>H 2. Does the wetland have the opportunity to provide habitat for many species?</b>	
<p><b>H 2.1 Buffers</b> (see p. 80)  Choose the description that best represents condition of buffer of wetland. The highest scoring criterion that applies to the wetland is to be used in the rating. See text for definition of "undisturbed."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— 100 m (330ft) of relatively undisturbed vegetated areas, rocky areas, or open water &gt;95% of circumference. No developed areas within undisturbed part of buffer. (relatively undisturbed also means no-grazing) <b>Points = 5</b></li> <li>— 100 m (330 ft) of relatively undisturbed vegetated areas, rocky areas, or open water &gt; 50% circumference. <b>Points = 4</b></li> <li>— 50 m (170ft) of relatively undisturbed vegetated areas, rocky areas, or open water &gt;95% circumference. <b>Points = 4</b></li> <li>— 100 m (330ft) of relatively undisturbed vegetated areas, rocky areas, or open water &gt; 25% circumference, . <b>Points = 3</b></li> <li>— 50 m (170ft) of relatively undisturbed vegetated areas, rocky areas, or open water for &gt; 50% circumference. <b>Points = 3</b></li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>If buffer does not meet any of the criteria above</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— No paved areas (except paved trails) or buildings within 25 m (80ft) of wetland &gt; 95% circumference. Light to moderate grazing, or lawns are OK. <b>Points = 2</b></li> <li>— No paved areas or buildings within 50m of wetland for &gt;50% circumference. Light to moderate grazing, or lawns are OK. <b>Points = 2</b></li> <li>— Heavy grazing in buffer. <b>Points = 1</b></li> <li>— Vegetated buffers are &lt;2m wide (6.6ft) for more than 95% of the circumference (e.g. tilled fields, paving, basalt bedrock extend to edge of wetland <b>Points = 0.</b></li> <li>— Buffer does not meet any of the criteria above. <b>Points = 1</b></li> </ul>	3
<p><b>H 2.2 Corridors and Connections</b> (see p. 81)</p> <p><b>H 2.2.1</b> Is the wetland part of a relatively undisturbed and unbroken vegetated corridor (either riparian or upland) that is at least 150 ft wide, has at least 30% cover of shrubs, forest or native undisturbed prairie, that connects to estuaries, other wetlands or undisturbed uplands that are at least 250 acres in size? (dams in riparian corridors, heavily used gravel roads, paved roads, are considered breaks in the corridor).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES = 4 points (go to H 2.3)      NO = go to H 2.2.2</p> <p><b>H 2.2.2</b> Is the wetland part of a relatively undisturbed and unbroken vegetated corridor (either riparian or upland) that is at least 50ft wide, has at least 30% cover of shrubs or forest, and connects to estuaries, other wetlands or undisturbed uplands that are at least 25 acres in size? <b>OR</b> a Lake-fringe wetland, if it does not have an undisturbed corridor as in the question above?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES = 2 points (go to H 2.3)      NO = H 2.2.3</p> <p><b>H 2.2.3</b> Is the wetland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>within 5 mi (8km) of a brackish or salt water estuary <b>OR</b></li> <li>within 3 mi of a large field or pasture (&gt;40 acres) <b>OR</b></li> <li>within 1 mi of a lake greater than 20 acres?</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">YES = 1 point      NO = 0 points</p>	1

**H 2.3 Near or adjacent to other priority habitats listed by WDFW (see p. 82)**

Which of the following priority habitats are within 330ft (100m) of the wetland?  
(see text for a more detailed description of these priority habitats)

☐ **Riparian:** The area adjacent to aquatic systems with flowing water that contains elements of both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems which mutually influence each other.

☐ **Aspen Stands:** Pure or mixed stands of aspen greater than 0.8 ha (2 acres).

☐ **Cliffs:** Greater than 7.6 m (25 ft) high and occurring below 5000 ft.

☐ **Old-growth forests:** (Old-growth west of Cascade crest) Stands of at least 2 tree species, forming a multi-layered canopy with occasional small openings; with at least 20 trees/ha (8 trees/acre) > 81 cm (32 in) dbh or > 200 years of age.

☐ **Mature forests:** Stands with average diameters exceeding 53 cm (21 in) dbh; crown cover may be less than 100%; crown cover may be less than 100%; decay, decadence, numbers of snags, and quantity of large downed material is generally less than that found in old-growth; 80 - 200 years old west of the Cascade crest.

☐ **Prairies:** Relatively undisturbed areas (as indicated by dominance of native plants) where grasses and/or forbs form the natural climax plant community.

☐ **Talus:** Homogenous areas of rock rubble ranging in average size 0.15 - 2.0 m (0.5 - 6.5 ft), composed of basalt, andesite, and/or sedimentary rock, including riprap slides and mine tailings. May be associated with cliffs.

☐ **Caves:** A naturally occurring cavity, recess, void, or system of interconnected passages

☐ **Oregon white Oak:** Woodlands Stands of pure oak or oak/conifer associations where canopy coverage of the oak component of the stand is 25%.

☐ **Urban Natural Open Space:** A priority species resides within or is adjacent to the open space and uses it for breeding and/or regular feeding; and/or the open space functions as a corridor connecting other *priority habitats*, especially those that would otherwise be isolated; and/or the open space is an isolated remnant of natural habitat larger than 4 ha (10 acres) and is surrounded by urban development.

☐ **Estuary/Estuary-like:** Deepwater tidal habitats and adjacent tidal wetlands, usually semi-enclosed by land but with open, partly obstructed or sporadic access to the open ocean, and in which ocean water is at least occasionally diluted by freshwater runoff from the land. The salinity may be periodically increased above that of the open ocean by evaporation. Along some low-energy coastlines there is appreciable dilution of sea water. Estuarine habitat extends upstream and landward to where ocean-derived salts measure less than 0.5ppt. during the period of average annual low flow. Includes both estuaries and lagoons.

☐ **Marine/Estuarine Shorelines:** Shorelines include the intertidal and subtidal zones of beaches, and may also include the backshore and adjacent components of the terrestrial landscape (e.g., cliffs, snags, mature trees, dunes, meadows) that are important to shoreline associated fish and wildlife and that contribute to shoreline function (e.g., sand/rock/log recruitment, nutrient contribution, erosion control).

If wetland has 3 or more priority habitats = 4 points

If wetland has 2 priority habitats = 3 points

If wetland has 1 priority habitat = 1 point

No habitats = 0 points

<p><b>H 2.4 Wetland Landscape</b> (<i>choose the one description of the landscape around the wetland that best fits</i>) (<i>see p. 84</i>)</p> <p>There are at least 3 other wetlands within ½ mile, and the connections between them are relatively undisturbed (light grazing between wetlands OK, as is lake shore with some boating, but connections should NOT be bisected by paved roads, fill, fields, or other development. <span style="float: right;">points = 5</span></p> <p>The wetland is Lake-fringe on a lake with little disturbance and there are 3 other lake-fringe wetlands within ½ mile <span style="float: right;">points = 5</span></p> <p>There are at least 3 other wetlands within ½ mile, BUT the connections between them are disturbed <span style="float: right;">points = 3</span></p> <p>The wetland is Lake-fringe on a lake with disturbance and there are 3 other lake-fringe wetland within ½ mile <span style="float: right;">points = 3</span></p> <p>There is at least 1 wetland within ½ mile. <span style="float: right;">points = 2</span></p> <p>There are no wetlands within ½ mile. <span style="float: right;">points = 0</span></p>	<p>3</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>H 2. TOTAL Score</b> - opportunity for providing habitat <i>Add the scores in the column above</i></p>	<p>14</p>
<p><b>Total Score for Habitat Functions</b> – add the points for H 1, H 2 and record the result on p. 1</p>	<p>14</p>

14

**Does the wetland being rated meet any of the criteria below?**

If you answer YES to any of the questions below you will need to protect the wetland according to the regulations regarding the special characteristics found in the wetland.

SP1. <i>Has the wetland been documented as a habitat for any Federally listed Threatened or Endangered plant or animal species (T/E species)?</i> For the purposes of this rating system, "documented" means the wetland is on the appropriate state or federal database.		✓
SP2. <i>Has the wetland been documented as habitat for any State listed Threatened or Endangered plant or animal species?</i> For the purposes of this rating system, "documented" means the wetland is on the appropriate state database.		✓
SP3. <i>Does the wetland contain individuals of Priority species listed by the WDFW for the state?</i>		✓
SP4. <i>Does the wetland have a local significance in addition to its functions? For example, the wetland has been identified in the Shoreline Master Program, the Critical Areas Ordinance, or in a local management plan as having special significance.</i>		✓

*To complete the next part of the data sheet you will need to determine the Hydrogeomorphic Class of the wetland being rated.*

The hydrogeomorphic classification groups wetlands into those that function in similar ways. This simplifies the questions needed to answer how well the wetland functions. The Hydrogeomorphic Class of a wetland can be determined using the key below. See p. 24 for more detailed instructions on classifying wetlands.




10/3/07  
"Fitness Center Wetland"

skunk cabbage  
water parsley  
slough sedge  
gooseberry  
Salmonberry  
Lonicera  
red osier  
Rosa #1  
Rosa #2  
cedar > 12"  
birch > 12"  
cottonwood > 12"  
lic fern  
vine maple  
red elderberry  
~~H. Blackberry~~  
spirea  
willow spp  
crabapple  
alder

- sedge/salmonberry
- CRAB/R. osier
- alder/salmon
- birch/alder
- vine maple/birch

lots small wood  
several large wood  
no pure water  
inlet: from tract  
leafy debris  
small snags + stumps





CHIEF MARTIN RD

KWANA RD

38N1E12-17

180 90 0 180 Feet



**Depressional Closed****Summary of Function Assessments**

<b>Function</b>	<b>Index</b>
Potential for Removing Sediment	10
Potential for Removing Nutrients	5
Potential for Removing Heavy Metals and Toxic Organics	4
Potential for Reducing Peak Flows	10
Potential for Reducing Decreasing Downstream Erosion	10
Potential for Groundwater Recharge	7
General Habitat Suitability	5
Habitat Suitability for Invertebrates	4
Habitat Suitability for Amphibians	3
Habitat Suitability for Anadromous Fish	N/A
Habitat Suitability for Resident Fish	N/A
Habitat Suitability for Wetland Associated Birds	5
Habitat Suitability for Wetland Associated Mammals	3
Native Plant Richness	7
Primary Production and Export	N/A